REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office action dated October 5, 2005, claims 1-20 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicant is adding new claim 21 with this Amendment and Response. Applicant is amending claims 1, 3, 7 and 13 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In making these amendments, Applicant does not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(a) in View of Getting Started with RealPublisher, Version 5.1

In the first and second paragraphs of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by a printed publication, Getting Started with RealPublisher, Version 5.1. ("RealPublisher"). This rejection is traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites, in part, "storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data." This claimed feature allows for fast and efficient access

and retrieval of media files by placing video tokens containing information about media files in a centralized location. The video token beneficially provides an identification mechanism for the media file.

RealPublisher does not disclose "storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data." RealPublisher discloses creating a Web page "in the specified directory, with an associated metafile containing information about your media file." (See RealPublisher p. 29, Item #12.) RealPublisher stores information associated with the media file in a user-selected directory. Rather than "storing a video token into a database," as recited in claim 1, RealPublisher discloses creating a "metafile" in a "specified directory." (See Id. p. 28, Item #8.) The lack of a central storage location in RealPublisher requires searching the entire directory structure of a computer to access different metafiles. Claim 1, in contrast, recites "storing a video token into a database" that only requires examination of a database, rather than a complete file structure, to access different video tokens. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-6.

Likewise, as claims 7 and 14 also recite "storing a video token in a database, wherein the video token is associated with the video data," all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 apply to claims 7 and 14 and all claims dependent on claims 7 and 14.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317

In the third and fourth paragraphs of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1, 7 and 14 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317 to Chaddha et al. ("Chaddha"). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "storing a video token into a database." This claim element is beneficial as it simplifies accessing video tokens and the associated media files by storing all video tokens in a single location. Chaddha does not disclose this limitation.

Chaddha discloses giving an "annotation stream" a "file name" and loading the named annotation stream into a "server." (See Chaddha col. 7, lines 45-47.) While Chaddha describes storing annotation streams associated with media files, the reference only discloses storing these annotation streams on a server. Chaddha does not disclose storing the annotation streams in a single location. It requires a search of a server file system, rather than a single database, to access different annotation streams. In contrast to Chaddha, claim 1 provides that the video tokens are stored in a database, so that only the database, rather than the entire server, must be searched to find a particular video token.

As claims 7 and 14 also recite "storing a video token into a database," all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 apply to claims 7 and 14.

Based on the above Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1, 7 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

Applicant has added new claim 21 for which Applicant requests consideration and examination. Applicants respectfully submit that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants' believe they are entitled.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-21, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Georges Auberger

Date: January 4, 2006   By: _____

Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200